



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,695	03/30/2004	Tae-Woong Koo	INTEL1510 (P18520)	7238
25227	7590	04/03/2007	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 400 MCLEAN, VA 22102			YU, MELANIE J	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/03/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/814,695	KOO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Melanie Yu	1641

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 8-13 and 47-54.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7 and 14-46.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Janice*  
3/28/07  
LONG V. LE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: for the reasons stated in the previous office action dated 24 January 2007.

Applicant argues that the instant specification teaches both the metal and the organic molecule contributing to the Raman signal enhancement that is greater than the enhancement provided by a silver colloid prepared by a titration method and neither Kidwell nor McCormick discloses or suggests the metallic colloid with the specific organic molecules as described in applicant's specification and therefore the enhancement would not be an inherent property of the colloid. Applicant's argument is not persuasive because in example 1 of the instant specification, parts A and B disclose preparing colloidal particles by titration and heating after dissolving the precursor. Example 1 also discloses comparing the Raman enhancement of the claimed method with the colloids prepared by the titration method, but does not specify that the organic molecules have been attached at the time of comparison nor during the colloidal preparation method. Therefore, the comparison of only the metallic colloids and not organic molecules takes place and the property is inherent to any metallic colloids prepared by the recited method. Furthermore, McCormick teaches the organic molecule of the instant specification and the combination of Kidwell and McCormick teach the molecule attached to the metallic colloid particle. Therefore, the enhancement property is inherent to the colloid produced by the combination of references.